



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/064,665

08/05/2002

John William Carbone

126726

5321

7590 05/04/2007
General Electric Company (PCPI)
c/o Fletcher Yoder
PO Box 692289
Houston, TX 77269-2289

EXAMINER

SHEIKH, ASFAND M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3627

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/04/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/064,665

Applicant(s)

CARBONE ET AL.

Examiner

Asfand M. Sheikh

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed on 01-Feb-2007 has been entered. Claims 1-50 are currently pending for examination.

The examiner maintains the same grounds of rejection. This action has been made final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 9, 14, 34, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

As per claim 9, 14, 34 and 39, the claim recites "hypertext transfer protocol server" which renders the claim indefinite. The recitation of "hypertext transfer protocol server" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of

Art Unit: 3627

the scope of the invention. The Examiner will interpret "hypertext transfer protocol server" to be a web application server (e.g. a web server that provides access to web pages).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-6, 16-17, 10, 24, 26-31, 41-42, 45, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh).

As per claim 1 and 26, Marsh discloses affixing a plurality of electronic asset identification devices to an asset whose location and information are to be managed (0020-0022; 0031; FIG. 1); programming each of the plurality of asset identification devices to include at least unique identification

Art Unit: 3627

information relating to the asset to which it is affixed (0020-0022; 0031; FIG. 1); maintaining at least one database containing information regarding the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed on an asset management server computer system (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1; the examiner interprets "data server" to be a database on an asset management server computer); operatively connecting a remote client computer system to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information over a computer network (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1; the examiner interprets a "transmission device" to be a remote client computer system); and operatively connecting at least one interrogation device to the remote client computer system (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1), wherein the at least one interrogation device is separate from the remote client computer system and receives information from the plurality of asset identification devices and exchanges said information with the remote client computer system (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1; the examiner interprets "computing device" to be the interrogation device).

As per claim 2 and 27, Marsh discloses wherein the plurality of electronic asset management devices include radio frequency identification tags (0022; FIG. 1).

Art Unit: 3627

As per claim 3 and 28, Marsh discloses wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a fixed radio frequency identification tag reader (0020-0022; FIG. 1; Examiner interprets "RF antenna" to be a fixed radio frequency identification tag reader).

As per claim 4 and 29, Marsh discloses wherein the at least one interrogation device includes a handheld radio frequency identification tag reader (0020-0022; FIG. 1).

As per claim 5 and 30, Marsh discloses wherein the handheld radio frequency identification tag reader is a handheld computing device (0020-0022; FIG. 1).

As per claim 6 and 31, Marsh discloses wherein the remote client computer system is the handheld computing device (0020-0022; FIG. 1).

As per claim 16 and 41, Marsh discloses synchronizing information between the at least one interrogation device and the remote client computer system, such that changes to the information made on the at least one interrogation device are

Art Unit: 3627

translated to the information maintained on the remote client computer system (0028).

As per claim 17 and 42, Marsh discloses synchronizing information between the remote computer system and the asset management server computer system, such that changes to the information made on the remote client computer system are translated to the information maintained on the asset management server computer system (0028).

As per claim 20 and 45, Marsh discloses wirelessly determining, by a computer software application resident on the at least one interrogation device, the presence of a plurality of electronic asset identification devices (0024).

As per claim 24 and 49, Marsh discloses synchronizing local asset management information with asset management information received from the asset management server computer system for a selected group of assets (0028).

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 7, 15, 32 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Examiner's Official Notice.

As per claim 7 and 32, Marsh fails to explicitly disclose operatively connecting at least one legacy database system to the asset management server computer system, for enabling exchange of legacy information relating to the assets to be managed.

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the art connect a server computer system to a legacy database in order to exchange information.

Art Unit: 3627

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include connecting a server computer system to a legacy database in order to exchange information as taught by the Official Notice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow the movement and merging of information from an older established data repository to a newer data repository.

As per claim 15 and 40, Marsh discloses a computing device as the remote client device (0021).

Marsh fails to explicitly disclose wherein the remote client computer system is a laptop or notebook style computer system

However, the Examiner takes Official Notice that it is notoriously old and well known in the art to utilize a laptop or notebook style computer in a computing environment.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include utilizing a laptop or notebook style computer in a computing environment as taught by the Official Notice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been

Art Unit: 3627

motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow a user the portability offered by a laptop/notebook style computer.

7. Claim 8 and 33 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Bothman et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0101108 (hereinafter Bothman).

As per claim 8 and 33, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Marsh fails to explicitly serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system.

However Bothman discloses serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include serving a plurality of interactive web pages relating to the asset identification devices and the assets to

Art Unit: 3627

which they are affixed from at least one web application server computer system as taught by Bothman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to portray accurate information related to the assets to users of the system in a quick and accurate manner (Bothman; 0008).

8. Claims 9-10, 14, 34-35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Bothman et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0101108 (hereinafter Bothman) as applied to claim 8 and 33 above, and further in view of Ahlberg et al. United States Patent 6,587,836 (hereinafter Ahlberg).

As per claim 9, 14, 34 and 39, Marsh fails to explicitly disclose operatively connecting at least one hypertext transfer protocol server computer system to the web application server computer system; and operatively connecting at least one authentication server computer system to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and login services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for

Art Unit: 3627

facilitating user login and authentication, wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

Bothman discloses a web application server (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include a web application server as taught by Bothman. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to portray accurate information related to the assets to users of the system in a quick and accurate manner.

Marsh and Bothman both fail to explicitly disclose and operatively connecting at least one authentication server computer system to the hypertext transfer protocol server for performing authentication and logon services, wherein the authentication server computer system is further operatively connected to an LDAP directory system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein information exchanges initiated by the remote client computer system result in a first connection between the remote client computer system and the at least one authentication server computer system.

Art Unit: 3627

However Ahlberg discloses a user at a web browser providing a user name/password at a remote client computer system connecting which connects to an authentication server which matches the provided user name/password with a security profile before granting access to the system (col. 10, lines 42-61 and col. 20, lines 12-52; FIG. 5; Examiner interprets "security profile" to be a directory system for authentication and logon services).

The Examiner notes the Ahlberg is analogous art for providing web based logon authentication system for displaying web pages.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh and Bothman to include a user at a web browser providing a user name/password at a remote client computer system connecting which connects to an authentication server which matches the provided user name/password with a security profile before granting access to the system as taught by Ahlberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide a web-based on-line system for processing data for services over the Internet (Ahlberg; col. 3, lines 14-17).

Art Unit: 3627

As per claim 10 and 35, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Bothman discloses displaying web pages to allow for modifying, rejecting, or accepting information related to data (ABSTRACT).

Ahlberg discloses web pages for presenting options, entry, modifying, canceling, searching, displaying information, customized reports, etc (ABSTRACT; col. 3, lines 61-67; col. 4, lines 1-23; col. 9, lines 29-48; and col. 16, lines 16-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Bothman, and Ahlberg to include displaying a home page; displaying a login page for receiving user login information; displaying a main menu page for displaying a plurality of options to users, selection of which a user to view and/or modify the asset management information maintained on the asset management web server computer system; displaying a project details page for displaying general information regarding asset management information relating to a selected project; displaying an asset search page for receiving asset search criteria from the user, the submission of which causes the asset management web server computer system to retrieve asset management information matching the submitted search

Art Unit: 3627

criteria; displaying an asset search results page for displaying the retrieved asset management information; and displaying an asset details page for displaying specific asset management information relating to a selected one of the assets displayed on the asst search results page. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide multiple web based pages that relate to pertinent information that should be able to be viewed online.

The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 35 seem to be directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.

Art Unit: 3627

9. Claims 11-13 and 36-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Bothman et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0101108 (hereinafter Bothman) and Ahlberg et al. United States Patent 6,587,836 (hereinafter Ahlberg) as applied to claim 10 and 35 above, and further in view of Fleskes United States Patent 6,529,910.

As per claim 11 and 36, Marsh, Bothman, and Ahlberg all fail to explicitly disclose operatively connection at least one authentication server computer system to the web application server computer system for facilitating user login and authentication, wherein the web server application serves different web pages depending upon login information received from the remote client computer system.

However Fleskes discloses displaying different web pages depending upon login information received (ABSTRACT).

The Examiner notes the Fleskes is analogous art for providing different web pages depending upon login information received.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings

Art Unit: 3627

of Marsh, Bothman, and Ahlberg to include displaying different web pages depending upon login information received as taught by Fleskes. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide varying levels of information that are available to the users of the system (ABSTRACT).

As per claims 12 and 37, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Bothman discloses displaying web pages to allow for modifying, rejecting, or accepting information related to data (ABSTRACT).

Ahlberg discloses web pages for presenting options, entry, modifying, canceling, searching, displaying information, customized reports, etc (ABSTRACT; col. 3, lines 61-67; col. 4, lines 1-23; col. 9, lines 29-48; and col. 16, lines 16-32).

Fleskes discloses displaying different web pages depending upon login information received (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Bothman, Ahlberg, and Fleskes to include receiving administrative level user login information; displaying a show report menu page for enabling users to select and create reports

Art Unit: 3627

of available asset management information; displaying a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized; displaying an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset; displaying an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset; displaying an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project; and displaying a resolve asset exception web page, wherein users may indicate that a selected exception has been resolved. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide varying levels of information that are available to the users of the system.

The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 37 seem to be directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.

As per claims 13 and 38, Marsh discloses a user interface for presenting interpreted data (0028).

Bothman discloses displaying web pages to allow for modifying, rejecting, or accepting information related to data (ABSTRACT).

Art Unit: 3627

Ahlberg discloses web pages for presenting options, entry, modifying, canceling, searching, displaying information, customized reports, etc (ABSTRACT; col. 3, lines 61-67; col. 4, lines 1-23; col. 9, lines 29-48; and col. 16, lines 16-32).

Fleskes discloses displaying different web pages depending upon login information received (ABSTRACT).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh, Bothman, Ahlberg, and Fleskes to include receiving material handling level user login information; displaying a synchronize web page for receiving file information for a file to be synchronized; displaying an asset receipt form web page for receiving a user indication regarding receipt of an asset; displaying an asset exception annotation web page for receiving information regarding an exception to be added to a selected asset; displaying an asset exception list page for displaying a listing of asset management exceptions associated with a selected project; displaying an asset storage maintenance details web page for displaying asset management information relating to the storage and maintenance of a selected asset; displaying an asset location form web page for displaying the physical location of a selected asset; and displaying an update asset location form web page for receiving updated asset

Art Unit: 3627

location information for a selected asset. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide varying levels of information that are available to the users of the system.

The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 38 seem to be directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.

10. Claim 18-19 and 43-44 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Ahlberg et al. United States Patent 6,587,836 (hereinafter Ahlberg).

As per claim 18 and 43, Marsh discloses modifying information contained on the asset management computer system (0028).

Marsh fails to explicitly disclose operatively connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server computer system for enabling users to access and modify information contained on the asset management computer system.

Art Unit: 3627

However Ahlberg discloses connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server for enabling users to access and modify information (col. 3, lines 61-67 and col. 4, lines 1-24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include connecting additional remote client computer systems to the asset management server for enabling users to access and modify information as taught by Ahlberg. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to provide a web-based on-line system for processing data for services over the Internet (Ahlberg; col. 3, lines 14-17).

As per claim 19 and 44, Marsh and Bothman both fail to explicitly disclose wherein users operating the additional remote client computer systems are provided specialized access depending upon login information received by the asset management server computer system.

However Ahlberg discloses specialized access depending upon login information received (col. 15, lines 34-51).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings

Art Unit: 3627

of Marsh and Bothman to include specialized access depending upon login information received as taught by Ahlberg. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 18 and 43, above.

11. Claim 21, 23, 46 and 48 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Cannon, Jr. et al. United States Patent 5,689,238 (hereinafter Cannon).

As per claim 21 and 46, Marsh fails to explicitly disclose determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device; indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user; and enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device.

However Cannon discloses determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device (col. 2, lines 42-59); indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user (col. 2, lines 42-59); and enhancing the indication

Art Unit: 3627

of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device (col. 2, lines 42-59).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include determining whether a selected electronic asset identification device is within a range of the interrogation device; indicating the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device to the user; and enhancing the indication of the presence of the selected electronic asset identification device upon increasing proximity to the selected electronic asset identification device as taught by Cannon. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to allow for random storage of items and useful for locating misplaced items (Cannon; col. 1, lines 43-46).

As per claim 23 and 48, Marsh discloses an interrogation device that communicates and corresponds information with the asset management server (0021-0022 and 0028).

Marsh fails to explicitly disclose receiving an asset location area description, scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification

Art Unit: 3627

devices.

However Cannon discloses receiving an asset location area description (col. 3, lines 27-45), scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices (col. 3, lines 27-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include receiving an asset location area description, scanning the asset location area to identify the presence therein of electronic asset identification devices as taught by Cannon. The motivation to combine is the same as claim 21 and 46, above.

12. Claim 22 and 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh).

As per claim 22 and 47, Marsh discloses presenting interpreted data through the user interface: the interrelated data being meaningful information regarding the tracked asset (0028).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings

Art Unit: 3627

of Marsh to include displaying asset management information regarding a selected asset, wherein the asset management information includes an indication regarding whether the selected asset has been confirmed; an indication that the selected asset has an electronic asset identification device affixed thereto; an indication regarding the presence of the affixed electronic asset identification; and an indication regarding the storage status of the selected asset. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify the teachings in order to provide information related to the asset.

The Examiner would like to note limitations recited in claim 47 seem to be directed to design choice for providing information catered to a specific environment.

13. Claims 25 and 50 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marsh et al. United States Patent Application Publication 2003/0023517 (hereinafter Marsh) in view of Radican United States Patent 6,148,291.

As per claim 25 and 50, Marsh fails to explicitly disclose receiving user confirmation that a selected asset has been

Art Unit: 3627

received; and receiving exception information relating to the selected asset.

However Radican discloses receiving user confirmation that a selected asset has been received (col. 5, lines 43-44); and receiving exception information relating to the selected asset (FIG. 10A and 10B).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the teachings of Marsh to include receiving user confirmation that a selected asset has been received; and receiving exception information relating to the selected asset as taught by Radican. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings in order to track the delivery of assets and to monitor the assets (Marsh; col. 2, lines 40-42).

Response to Arguments

14. Applicant's arguments filed 01-Feb-2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to claims 9, 14, 34, and 39, the examiner notes the applicant traverses the U.S.C. § 112 rejection of "hypertext transfer protocol server" and provides an explanation found in paragraph 39. The examiner disagrees.

Art Unit: 3627

The examiner notes that passage 39 discloses a hypertext transfer protocol (e.g. http address) and further discloses the use of hypertext transfer protocol to reach web pages provided on a web server. There is no discloser regarding a specific "hypertext transfer protocol server." The examiner maintains the position that a "hypertext transfer protocol server" is web server that provides access to web pages. This argument is not persuasive.

With respect to claims 1-6, 16-17, 20, 24, 26-31, 41-42, 45, and 49, the examiner notes that the applicant argues that Marsh fails to teach a remote client computer system that is separate from the interrogation device and a assent management server computer system. The examiner disagrees.

The examiner notes that Marsh, as interpreted, teaches an asset management server computer system (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1; the examiner interprets "data server" to be a database on an asset management server computer); operatively connecting a remote client computer system to the asset management server computer system for exchanging information over a computer network (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1; the examiner interprets a "transmission device" to be a remote client computer system); and operatively connecting at least one interrogation device to

Art Unit: 3627

the remote client computer system (0020-0022; 0028; 0031; FIG. 1), and operatively connecting at least one interrogation device to the remote client computer system the examiner interprets "computing device" to be the interrogation device). Marsh supports a prima facie case of anticipation because Marsh does disclose all of the claimed elements. This argument is not persuasive.

With respect to claims 2-25 and claims 27-50, the examiner notes the applicant argues that Marsh fails to disclose all of the claimed elements of the independent claims. The examiner disagrees.

The examiner notes Marsh, as interpreted, (see arguments directed to claims 1 and 26) supports a prima facie case of anticipation because Marsh does disclose all of the claimed elements. This argument is not persuasive.

With respect to claims 7 and 32, the examiner notes the applicant argues the examiner's Official Notice. The examiner notes that the applicant has not provided a proper traversal (Please see MPEP 2144.03 (C)). The examiner notes for a proper traversal "an applicant must specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action, which would include stating why

Art Unit: 3627

the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art." The examiner notes the applicant has not stated "why" the noticed fact is not considered to be common knowledge or well-known in the art. This argument is not persuasive.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. United States Patent 6,286,762 [Method and Apparatus to Perform A Predefined search on Data Carries, Such AS RFID Tags (more specifically, FIG. 1)].

16. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated

Art Unit: 3627

from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Asfand M. Sheikh whose telephone number is (571) 272-1466. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8a-4:30p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan M. Zeender can be reached on (571) 272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3627

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Asfand M Sheikh
Examiner
Art Unit 3627

ams
28-Apr-07


F. RYAN ZEENDER
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER